## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added and the amendments are supported by paragraphs [0036] and [0037] of the Applicant's specification. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### Examiner Objections – Specification

The specification was objected to because of informalities. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of the specification. In response, the Applicant has modified the specification as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's consideration of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The limitation "modifying the second security association (SA2) by using selected components of the second protocol" is pointed out as not being taught in the application.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the following cites provide support for the above limitation in claims 1 and 5: 1) "The IPSec SA data <u>relevant</u> to encryption, including a pair of encryption keys, is then passed to the VoIP applications" (paragraph [0037]) and 2) "As the IP data is not subjected to the complete IPSec procedure, the resulting IP packets do not include IPSec headers including AH and ESP headers" (paragraph [0038]). Regarding cite 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that the phrase "data relevant to encryption" indicates that part of the IPSec SA data is used along with the pair of encryption keys. Also, regarding cite 2, the Applicant submits that the IP data is subjected to less than a full IPSec procedure.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected also as being indefinite because of an ambiguous limitation. The Applicant has reviewed the limitation and determined that the limitation language is wrong. The limitation should read "using the first security association (SA1) to establish a second security association (SA2) over a second protocol between the first and second nodes;". This amendment is supported by paragraph [0036] and [0037]. The appropriate amendment has been made and the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 5 for the above reasons.

Claims 2-4 and 6-7 depend from respective independent claims 1 and 5, and the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

The limitation "the second security association (SA2) in line 8 of claims 1 and 5 now has proper antecedent basis because of the amendment to claims 1 and 5.

## Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1 and 3-6  stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamros, et al (hereinafter Mamros) United States Letter Patent Number 6,360,269 in view of Patel, et al. IP Security Working Group, Internet Draft, Intel Corporation (hereinafter Patel).  The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims

As noted above, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 5 to clarify the use of a first security association to establish a second security association. Mamros does not disclose the use of a first security association to establish a second security association.

The Patel reference is cited for using phase 1 negotiation to establish security association between the first node and second node. However, Patel does not disclose using a first security association to establish a second security association, which is then modified by selected components of the second protocol. (paragraph [0036-0037]) Therefore, neither Mamros nor Patel disclose the aforementioned limitation osf using a first security association to establish a second security association.  This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 3-4 depend from amended independent claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Amended independent claim 5 is analogous to and contains limitations similar to the novel limitations of amended independent claim 1. Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and contains the same novel limitation. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-6.

Claims 2 and 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamros et al US 6,360,269 (hereinafter Mamros) in view of Patel et al. IP Security Working Group, Internet Draft, Intel Corporation (hereinafter Patel) and further in view of Dutnall, US 6,584, 098 (hereinafter Dutnall). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim.

The Dutnall reference appears to disclose a method wherein streamed data packets do not include IPSec headers, authentication headers and encapsulation security payload headers. However, Dutnall fails to teach or suggest the use of a first security association to establish a second security association, which is then modified. Claims 2 and 7 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 5 and contain the same novel limitations of claims 1 and 5. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 7.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com